

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, and 24 are independent.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, stating that they do not show an enclosure. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating that it is not clear "how a barrier and said first support member and said second support member defin[e] an enclosure?"

Applicant respectfully traverses both the objection and the rejection. As an initial matter, the Examiner has stated that an enclosure is "typically constructed with four sides perpendicular to a base." Applicant notes that the term enclosure, in both general usage and in the Applicant's specification, is a broader term, and refers to any space that is enclosed. It is not limited to an enclosure formed by four sides that are perpendicular to a base.

In any case, regardless of the definition of enclosure, Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to paragraph [0020] and Figures 1, 4, and 5. The cited paragraph explains that in the disclosed exemplary embodiment the enclosure 46 is formed by a base and four sides that are generally perpendicular to the base. These features are shown in Figures 1, 4, and 5. In particular, the second side 50 of the barrier 16 forms the base of the enclosure 46. The first panel 24 and third panel 28 of the barrier 16 form two of the four sides (the first side 48 and the third side 52) of the enclosure. The inner surfaces 30 and 32 of the support members 12, 14 form the other two sides (the fourth side 54 and fifth side 56) of the enclosure. These features are all illustrated in Figures 1, 4, and 5. Accordingly, the specification describes how the barrier 16 and first and second support members 12 and 14 define an enclosure 46 that has a base and four sides.

Furthermore, the specification describes how the housing 20 can be a fire resistant housing. *See* para. [0022]. This feature is shown in FIGS. 1, 4, and 5. The feature in claim 1, lines 7-8, of "a fire resistant housing . . . releasably coupled to said first and second support members" is therefore shown in the drawings.

In view of the cited description and the figures, Applicant asserts that the objection to the drawings is improper, and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is improper. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections.

Appl. No. 10/743,543
Amdt. dated 11/11/2004
Reply to Office Action of July 23, 2004

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 11, 2004



Michael E. Stimson
Reg. No. 41,333
Attorney for Applicant

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
(202) 659-9076